

### **REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12 and 13 are currently being prosecuted. Claims 7 and 11 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

#### **Entry of Amendment**

Applicants request that the present Amendment be entered and given full consideration. By way of the present amendments, Applicants have amended claim 6 to include the limitations of claim 14. Thus, no new issues are presented therein. Likewise, claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form so that this does not present any new issues. Applicants have also added the limitation from claim 13 to claim 1 to place it in allowable form in the same fashion. While claim 13 did not originally depend from claim 1, Applicants submit that this addition is so similar to that of the rewriting of claim 13 in independent form that no new issues would be involved, especially since the Examiner has indicated that this limitation is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants request the entry of this Amendment and full consideration thereof.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection and rewritten in independent form. Although not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejections, claim 6 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 14, and claim 13 has been rewritten in independent

form. Also, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 13 as well. Accordingly, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

*Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112*

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner points out that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the material pair.” By way of the present amendment, Applicants have replaced this phrase with the equivalent phrase “the traction sheave and hoisting ropes.” Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome.

*Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruns (U. S. Patent 3,279,762). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By way of the present amendments, Applicants have added the allowable limitations from claims 13 and 14 to independent claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable even without the addition of these limitations from claims 13 and 14. The last two lines of claims 1 and 6 clearly indicate that the hoisting rope can bite into the material of the traction sheave after the coating has been lost. As described in the specification, this is an important feature since, in the event of a fire or other unusual circumstance, this coating may be lost with the result that traction sheave may not be able to have enough friction to move the hoisting ropes and thus control the elevator. The present invention provides for the feature that even if this coating is removed, the hoisting rope

will still be able to have enough friction to grip the traction sheave so that control can be maintained in the elevator even in the event of a disaster. Applicants submit that the Bruns reference does not teach this feature.

In the Bruns reference, the channels 13 are filled with an insert 21 made of an elastomer strip. The elastomer material is formed into treads 35 and voids 33 to further aid traction. However, this reference does not in any manner teach the concept of the hoisting rope being able to bite into the traction sheave after the coating has been lost. In the first two lines on page 3 of the Action, the Examiner states that the sheave and hoisting rope determine a material pair that does allow the rope to bite into the sheave after the coating has been lost. However, the Examiner has not in any fashion shown where this feature is found in the reference. Applicants submit that such a feature is not taught by Bruns and that the entire concept has not even been considered except in hindsight after viewing the present application. Thus, Applicants submit that the Bruns reference does not anticipate the present invention defined by claims 1 and 6 and the claims which depend therefrom.

*Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bruns in view of Piech et al. (U. S. Patent 6,267,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies on Piech et al. to teach an elevator rope with a diameter of between 3 and 5 mm. Applicants submit that even if this reference does teach this feature, this claim remains allowable based on its dependency from allowable claim 1.

Withdrawn Claims

Claims 7 and 11 have been withdrawn since they are directed to a non-elected species. Applicants submit that since claims 1 and 6 are now allowable and since these claims are generic that claims 7 and 11 should now also be considered and allowed.

Conclusion


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No.: 32,334  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicants